

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed on February 11, 2008 has been reviewed carefully and the application amended in a sincere effort to place the application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection of the claims, and allowance of the same, are respectfully requested on the basis of the following remarks.

Upon entry of this Amendment, Claims 1-12, 14, 16-17, and 19-20 will be pending in the application. Claims 13, 15 and 18 have been canceled.

Rejection of claims 1-13, 16-17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-13, 16-17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) for allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Pat. Appl. Pub. No. 2002/0114955 (hereinafter, referred to as Lamers).

Claim 1 has been amended to recite the feature that crosslinking agent comprises a melamine resin wherein the melamine resin does not have any NH groups.

As the Examiner has indicated in the Office Action on page 3-4, Lamers does not disclose using a melamine crosslinking agent wherein the melamine does not have any NH groups.

Because Lamers does not disclose every feature that is recited in amended claim 1, the Applicants respectfully submit that directly or indirectly therefrom are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Applicants request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn and the Notice of Allowance issued at an early date.

Rejection of claims 14, 15, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 14, 15, and 20 for allegedly being unpatentable over Lamers in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,429,256 (hereinafter, referred to as Vandervoorde).

Attached to this letter is a statement indicating that Lamers as well as the inventor of the present application was subject to an obligation of assignment to

same person at the time the claimed invention was made. Pursuant to MPEP 706.02(l)(2), the statement contained within the attached document is sufficient evidence to support the fact that Lamers as well as the present invention are of common ownership. Accordingly, under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) Lamers cannot be used as a reference under 35 U.S.C. 103.

Because Vandervoorde alone does not disclose and/or suggest every feature that is recited in the Applicant's amended claim 1, the Applicants submit that claim 1, and the claims that depend directly or indirectly therefrom, are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing arguments, it is submitted that claims 1-12, 14, 16-17, and 19-20 are in proper form for issuance of a Notice of Allowance and such action is respectfully requested at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert A. Diaz
Registration No. 55,109
Attorney for Applicant
PPG Industries, Inc.
One PPG Place – 39th Floor
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15272
Phone: (412) 434-2931
Fax: (412) 434-4292

STATEMENT ESTABLISHING COMMON OWNERSHIP

U.S. Patent Application No. 10/509,218 and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0114955 were, at the time the invention of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/509,218 was made, owned by PPG Industries, Inc. PPG Industries, Inc. owns one hundred percent (100%) of PPG Industries Ohio, Inc. as well as PPG Industries Lacke GmbH.

Date: 6-13-08 